

State of California

Memorandum

To : Mr. Frank Piccola
CALFED Bay-Delta Program

Date : September 29, 1997

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671		# of pages > 2
To	Frank Piccola	From
Co.	CALFED	Co.
Dept.		Phone #
Fax #		Fax #

From : Department of Fish and Game

Subject: Comments on Draft Impact Analysis Technical Reports

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject documents. The following are our specific comments:

~~Draft Fish, Wildlife and Recreation~~
~~Economics Affected Environmental Technical Report~~

Table ES-1: This table displays the commercial harvest values of salmon for 1992. It isn't clear to us why only 1992 is used. Table 3-6 data show that for the period of 1986-1990 annual income was significantly higher for all subregions, especially the North Coast. The North Coast personal income total was \$100,000 in 1992 compared to \$16.2 million in the 1986-90 percent. This discrepancy puts into doubt the reliance of any 1992 data for the programmatic EIR/EIS.

Considering the other data available and presented in this technical report and because of the Klamath Management Zone closure, we believe it is not appropriate to only summarize the table 3-8 data in the executive summary.

Pages 3-4 to 3-7, San Francisco and San Pablo Bays: The historical perspective and current resource conditions need to include discussion of recreation use at state and federal refuges in this area similar to that done for the Sacramento River Region.

Table 3-1: This table displays annual visitation in visitor days for sport fishing using dollar signs. These dollar signs should be deleted.

Page 5: Tables 1 and 2 need to be edited to place correct headings for the two columns of data.

Page 7: The correct name and acronym should be used for the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP).

Mr. Frank Piccola
September 29, 1997
Page Two

**Draft Fish, Wildlife, and Recreation Economics
Environmental Impacts Technical Reports**

Page 9; Fourth Paragraph: Benefits attributed to increased hunting recreation use on in-Delta storage islands are overstated. Because of the storage aspects wildlife volumes will be very low and recreation benefits nearly non-existent. Reference to isolated conveyance channels and three new intakes should be deleted.

Page 10; Alternative 3: The same comment regarding in-Delta storage applies here as well.

Page 13: Delete any reference to increased hunting recreation use in the Bay Region as a result of in-Delta storage.

Page 16 and 17: Delete any reference to increased hunting recreation use in the Bay Region as a result of in-Delta storage.

Page 19 and 20: Delete any reference to increased hunting recreation use in the Bay Region as a result of in-Delta storage.

Pages 21 through 22; SWP/CVP Service Areas: The explanations for relative differences in net benefits among the various alternatives and data displayed in Table 7 do not appear to be supported. A clear explanation and rationale need to be provided.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any concerns or questions regarding these comments, please contact Mr. Frank Wernette at (209) 948-7800 or CALNET 8/423-7800.



Pete Chadwick
CALFED/DFG Liaison

cc: Mr. Frank Wernette, BDD

FW971630.wpd:fw/cc